1	KCF7FARC
2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	X
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
5	v. 18 Cr. 340 (LGS)
6	ROBERT FARKAS,
7	Defendant.
8	X
9	New York, N.Y. December 15, 2020 11:00 a.m.
LO	11.00 a.m.
1	Before:
L2	HON. LORNA G. SCHOFIELD District Judge
L3	District oddye
4	APPEARANCES (via telephone)
.5	AUDREY STRAUSS Acting United States Attorney for the
L6	Southern District of New York  BY: SAMSON ENZER  DANIEL LOSS  NEGAR TEKEII  Assistant United States Attorneys
.7	
.8	
.9	BRIAN KLEIN PAUL PETRUZZI SANFORD TALKIN Attorneys for Defendant
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

(Case called)

DEPUTY COURT CLERK: Good morning. We are here in the matter of 18 Crim. 340, United States of America v. Robert Farkas. Before we begin, I would like too remind the parties and anyone listening that recording or rebroadcasting of this proceeding is prohibited. Violation of this prohibition may results in sanctions. We are here before the Honorable Lorna G. Schofield. If counsel would just state their name for the record.

MS. TEKEEI: Good morning, your Honor. Negar Tekeei on behalf of the United States, and joining me are my colleagues AUSAs Sam Enzer and Dan Loss. I would also like to note that our special agents Brendan Rav and Kristen Elaine are also joining by phone.

THE COURT: Great.

MR. PETRUZZI: Good morning, your Honor. Paul
Petruzzi on behalf of Robert Farkas. Mr. Farkas is present
remotely, participating in the proceedings from his home. Also
present with me are cocounsel, Sam Talkin and Brian Klein.

THE COURT: OK. Good morning, everyone.

As you can see, we are proceeding by video conference, and I myself is outside the District. Mr. Farkas, can you see and hear me?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning. If at any point you cannot

see or hear me, or anybody else, please let me know, and we 1 2 will try to fix that. OK? 3 THE DEFENDANT: OK. 4 THE COURT: You have the right to be physically 5 present for your sentencing. Your lawyer has made a written 6 request that we proceed remotely, because I understand you are 7 living in Florida, and of course travel is risky during the days of the pandemic. And your lawyer has stated that you 8 9 waive your right to be physically present. Is that correct? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: And do you want us to proceed with your 12 sentencing this way by video? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: I find the proceeding cannot be further 15 delayed without serious harm to the interests of justice, because Mr. Farkas is understandably eager for the sentencing 16 17 to proceed, and the proceedings in this case have been 18 previously delayed because of the pandemic. 19 Mr. Farkas, do you have family members or friends who 20 are there with you or are joining us by phone? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, my parents are here. 22 THE COURT: Do you want to just introduce them and let 23 them say hello? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sure. 25

THE COURT: Thank you all for being here.

extremely important for a court in this kind of situation to understand that the defendant has lots of support. And it's clear to me not only from the letters I have read but also from your family's presence here that you do, so thank you for introducing them and thank you for having them.

We are here today to impose sentence in the case of United States v. Robert Farkas. Mr. Farkas pleaded guilty to two counts, the first conspiracy to commit securities fraud, and the second conspiracy to commit wire fraud. This was all pursuant to a plea agreement dated June 15, 2020.

To prepare for the proceeding today, I have reviewed the presentence report — which was last revised in September of 2020 — and also received and reviewed the defendant's submission dated October 16, 2020, and the letters that I just referenced. So, for the record I have read them, but I will mention who I have read letters from. So Mr. Farkas, I have your letter and I have read it. Thank you. I also have letters from your immediate family members: Brielle Farkas, your sister, who I just met; Cynthia Farkas, your mother; also Robert Farkas, your father; Dyesha Lee, your sister; Christina McGowen, your sister; and Donna Valez, your fiancee.

I also have letters from other family members:

Christopher Farkas, your uncle; Glenn Farkas, your uncle; Jean

Farkas, your aunt; Travis Lee, your brother-in-law; Alexis

Maziarski, your niece; and Lucy Valez, your fiancee's mother.

I also have letters from friends: Donna Destefano,

Dyana Koon, Andrew Malwicki, Nicole Parico, and Marina

Quasiato. I also have a letter from Dr. Rafeal Kellman as well

as a copy of your medical records.

In addition, I have the government's submission which

In addition, I have the government's submission which is dated October 30, 2020. I also received and reviewed 24 victim impact statements and a related letter from the government that I received yesterday.

Is there anything I am missing, Mr. Petruzzi?

MR. PETRUZZI: No, your Honor, not that I am aware of.

THE COURT: Ms. Tekeei, is there anything I'm missing?

MS. TEKEEI: No, your Honor. I do believe we received one additional victim impact statement yesterday, which our victim witness coordinator is preparing and our paralegals are preparing to produce to the Court, however, the Court has accurately looked at everything that has been submitted to the Court so far.

THE COURT: All right. And the additional victim impact statement, do you either want to summarize it for me or tell me it's substantially the same as the others that I have reviewed?

MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, it is substantially the same as the others that you have reviewed.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I would also note that I have reviewed the transcript

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of Mr. Farkas's quilty plea before Judge Cott, which took place on June 16, 2020, and I signed an order accepting your plea. Mr. Petruzzi, have you read the presentence report? MR. PETRUZZI: Yes, I have, your Honor, as well as the addendum. THE COURT: And have you discussed it with your client? MR. PETRUZZI: Yes, your Honor, I have. We have reviewed all matters in the presentence report and any pertinent objections thereto, all of which have been resolved. THE COURT: Thank you. And, Mr. Farkas, have you read the presentence report and discussed it with your lawyers? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: And have you had the opportunity to go over with him any errors in the report or anything else that you think should be taken up with the court? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Ms. Tekeei, have you reviewed the presentence report? MS. TEKEEI: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: So, I will put the question to you first Ms. Tekeei. Putting aside the calculations of the sentencing quidelines, does the government have any objections to the report regarding its factual accuracy?

MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, we have one clarification to make, and it is consistent with the substance of the government's letter that was submitted yesterday. It is with respect to paragraph 155 of the PSR. That paragraph described a victim impact statement in which the victim reported that his failed Centra Tech investment led to the divorce from his wife, and so we request that that particular paragraph be clarified, as we have no objection to removing that particular sentence, which I believe is ten lines down from the top and begins with "additionally another victim". Consistent with our letter of yesterday, we have no objection to striking that sentence from the PSR.

THE COURT: OK. So, is this actually a request to amend the presentence report and strike the sentence?

MS. TEKEEI: I mean technically it is, your Honor, and I am certain defense counsel have no objection to that. But the Court should certainly inquire.

THE COURT: All right.

And, Mr. Petruzzi, do you have any objections to the report regarding its factual accuracy?

MR. PETRUZZI: No, your Honor, I do not. Consistent with Ms. Tekeei's, I guess, request for clarification or revision of the report, I would also ask that it just simply note that because of the circumstances, the government hasn't independently verified all of the information in the victim

impact statements. But having said that, none of it I believe changes the guidelines calculations that the parties have arrived at. I think it would go probably to the weight that your Honor would accord each of the victim impact statements.

THE COURT: So, you are also asking for a note that that the government has not independently verified all the victim impact statements. I actually recall reading that but I don't recall reading it necessarily in the presentence report.

Ms. Tekeei, do you have any objection to that amendment as long as we are amending the report?

MS. TEKEEI: No, your Honor. I think that's consistent with our letter from yesterday, which is where the Court probably first saw that language, and so we have no objection to a statement along the lines of the government has produced to the Court and to the defense the victim impact statements that have been submitted to its victim witness coordinator, without undertaking to independently verify all of the assertions contained in those victim impact statements.

THE COURT: OK. So, I will adopt the factual recitation set forth in the presentence report with those two amendments: One, regarding a clarification to paragraph 155 as we discussed, and the other is to add a note about the victim impact statements in general.

I direct that a complete copy of the presentence report be prepared for the Bureau of Prisons and the Sentencing

Commission. The report will be made part of the record in this matter and placed under seal. If an appeal is taken, counsel on appeal may have access to the report without further application.

Mr. Farkas, what I would like to do now is turn to the sentencing guidelines. We are still required to consider the guidelines in determining what the appropriate sentence is, although we're not required to follow the recommendation. But, in any event, it's necessary for me to accurately calculate what the guidelines recommendation is.

So, as you know in this case, there was a plea agreement between you and the government in which the parties stipulated to a particular calculation of the guidelines, and the calculation in the presentence report appears to be the same as what appears in your plea agreement, so I assume there is no objection to the calculation in the presentence report.

Is that right, Ms. Tekeei?

MS. TEKEEI: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Petruzzi, is that right?

MR. PETRUZZI: Yes, your Honor, it is. Thank you.

THE COURT: So, based on the parties' agreement, and the absence of objection, as well as my independent evaluation of the sentencing guidelines, I accept the guideline calculation in the presentence report. I find the offense level is 27 and the Criminal History Category is I.

So, Mr. Farkas, what all of that means is that the recommended prison term under the guidelines is 70 to 87 months, as well as a fine between \$25,000 and \$250,000 supervised release of one to three years on each count, and probation is not recommended.

That of course is separate from the maximum sentence that I can impose, which is much greater. The maximum term of imprisonment is up to five years on each count, which comes to a total of ten years. The maximum fine is \$250,000. Supervised release under the statute, the maximum is three years. And the statute would also permit probation of up to five years.

There is a mandatory special assessment of \$100 per count or \$200, which I will impose. And with regard to restitution, on November 5, 2020 I granted the government's motion, finding that restitution is impracticable in this case. And with respect to forfeiture, I understand and have seen an agreement that the defendant consents to the entry of a money judgment against him in the amount of \$347,062.58; also that the defendant has never claimed to have any right, title or interest in any of the 100,000 ether units that the F.B.I. seized in 2018 in connection with this case; and finally Mr. Farkas consents to the forfeiture of a particular Rolex watch that his co-defendant, Mr. Sharma, gave him from proceeds of the crimes that are charged and admitted.

Are there any objections to the sentencing options I have outlined? Mr. Petruzzi?

MR. PETRUZZI: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: Ms. Tekeei?

MS. TEKEEI: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: So, I see from the plea agreement that neither party believes that an upward or downward departure is appropriate, so while I have authority to depart, I decline to do that. That of course is separate from a variance. And for some of the people listening, that's all a way of saying technically that the parties have reserved their right to ask the Court to vary from the recommendation in the guidelines.

So, I will hear from the government first.

MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, one housekeeping matter, with the Court's permission prior to our discussion of the guidelines and the sentencing factors. And the court has already alluded to this.

But one additional factor to why we believe there is a CARES Act basis to proceed here via video conference remotely is that because restitution is impracticable in this case, and the government intends to proceed via the well established process of forfeiture and remission to compensate the victims of fraud in this case, that process cannot begin until after the assets have been judicially forfeited and following the entry of a final order of forfeiture. So, sentencing is

important and the final order of forfeiture are critical components in that process, and as this case has been pending for more than two and a half years, the victims here do have an interest in seeing it resolved and proceeding toward the point at which they can receive compensation. And we add that only to supplement the record as to the Court's original findings that we may proceed under the CARES Act by video conference.

THE COURT: OK, thank you. And I will adopt what you said as additional findings as the basis to proceed by video. And as long as we are on the subject, could you tell me what the schedule is for compensating the victims. What steps have to be taken and when do you expect it to happen?

MS. TEKEEI: The first step would be the final order of forfeiture, which happens after the preliminary order of forfeiture is posted and victims and other parties have 30 days to raise their hands and raise any issues that they may have with the preliminary order of forfeiture. Once the funds are actually forfeited, then they go through the remissions process with main Justice, the Department of Justice. I don't sitting here today have a schedule, and I wouldn't want to get out ahead of ourselves on predicting the exact time line, but it is our offices's recommendation, and we do seek to attempt to proceed with the remissions process.

The victims in this case have been notified about various matters, various proceedings via our victim

notification system, and we intend to alert the victims in this case about the opportunity for remission and what they will need to do in order to seek remission via the same victim notification system.

an order asking for status so that I understand that this is proceeding. Obviously, getting compensation to the victims is important for many reams. Obviously it's important to the victims, but I think it's also relevant to the sentencing here, in that the argument has been made that victims largely will be fully compensated or close to fully compensated. But that only has peace if it comes to pass and it comes to pass relatively promptly.

So, would you have any objections and do you have any suggestions as to who the directive should be addressed so that I can get timely and accurate reports as to what is happening with the remission system?

MS. TEKEEI: Certainly, your Honor. I would like to answer the Court's question with clarity. I think some of that really depends on the sentencing of Mr. Farkas's co-defendant, who in connection with his sentencing has agreed to forfeit the \$100,000 ether that the government seized. So, I don't have a perfect answer for you today, but how about the government will provide the Court with a letter indicating how best to proceed in terms of status updates to the Court and to whom the Court

can address any future directives related to the remissions process. I apologize for not having more perfect answers for your Honor today, but I would rather not answer with an answer that's not clear or inaccurate, and so we certainly can provide the Court with better information and further clarification, now that the Court has posed these questions.

THE COURT: OK, I appreciate that.

Another question I have is it sounded from your answer as though this process can't begin until the sentencing of the co-defendant who has agreed to forfeit the ether. Is that correct?

MS. TEKEEI: Yes, your Honor. A preliminary order of forfeiture has been entered in connection with Mr. Sharma, however, that order of forfeiture is not yet final, and sentencing is an important component to that.

THE COURT: OK. I should know this, but I don't have it handy. Do you know what our sentencing date is for Mr. Sharma?

MS. TEKEEI: I believe it's January 19, but I can double check.

THE COURT: That's all right. I am sure Mr. Street has it.

DEPUTY COURT CLERK: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So, having addressed that restitution process, do you

have other remarks with regard to sentencing?

MS. TEKEEI: Thank you, your Honor. And we will try to be brief and only amplify some of the points in our prior submission.

As the Court is now aware from the lengthy briefing in this matter, the PSR and the parties' submissions in connection with sentencing, Mr. Farkas and his coconspirators first lied to their victims in order to raise more than \$25 million in victim investor funds, and then they lied to cover up the scheme and lull their victims when certain aspects of their fraud were discovered and widely publicized.

Mr. Farkas in particular embraced and participated in the lie about Centra Tech's fake partnerships with Bancorp,
Visa and Mastercard. He used his family photographs as fake
Centra Tech executives to perpetuate the material fiction that those executives who had substantial but entirely faked credentials actually listed. He recorded and produced videos stating state demonstrations of the so-called Centra Card to mislead investors, and he helped to manipulation the price of digital Centra Tech tokens issued by Centra Tech as part of the ICO -- or the initial coin offering. These are undisputed facts for the PSR.

As we conveyed in our sentencing submission, your Honor, we certainly recognize that there are mitigating factors here that do weigh in favor of a below guidelines range

sentence. Those include Mr. Farkas's role in the offense, the amount of money he personally received, the steps he has taken to get his life back on track after the arrest, and the support that he has provided to his young family and the support his family has provided to him. However, we do not believe that these factors are so extraordinary that they should give rise to a sentence of no additional incarceration.

Mr. Farkas and his co-conspirators capitalized on a burgeoning new world of cryptocurrency investments. They used that as their primary vehicle for the fraud, the initial coin offering, a new type of investment opportunity. And as compared to more traditional ways of raising capital, I feel it presents increased risk of fraud and manipulation, and they make it more difficult to trace investment by victim investors — a real problem and a real issue that we are having in this case here. It's not a hypothetical issue.

By peddling lives about fake executives, fake business relationships and fake cards under the auspices of an initial coin offering, Mr. Farkas and his coconspirators took advantage of hundreds of victim investors in a relatively short timeframe, a sentence of additional incarceration will send the important message that lies and deceit in the innovative digital securities world will be met with the same consequences as lies and deceit in more traditional markets.

Against this backdrop, the type of sentence that Mr.

Farkas is requesting is not appropriate when considering the serious nature of the offense and the need to afford just punishment and to promote general deterrence.

And with respect to Mr. Farkas's medical concerns, your Honor, this is not a binary issue. There is a clear middle road here where the Court can -- and we submit should -- impose the sentence that it would on Mr. Farkas absent the COVID-19 pandemic, and simply direct the latest surrender date as this court and other courts in this district have done in light of the pandemic. Unless the Court has any other questions, we have no further statements.

THE COURT: Thank you. I don't have any further questions.

Mr. Petruzzi, would you like to be heard?

MR. PETRUZZI: If I may, may it please the Court, good morning again, your Honor.

First, I would like to thank Ms. Tekeei and also Mr. Enzer and Mr. Loss, and I would like to thank my cocounsel as well, Judge, Mr. Talkin and Mr. Klein.

For the past two years or more a little bit I have had the pleasure of working with this extraordinary group of lawyers. In a sense, I think, as your Honor can see from Ms. Tekeei's argument, we have worked collaboratively to try to get the victims made whole. We have all known for some time that there would have been an ability to liquidate the seized ether

tokens that the government has, and we have worked to make that happen. So, while it has been great to work with everybody, it's not to say that we haven't had our disagreements as we have worked through this process. And one of those disagreements is right now, and that's what sentence your Honor would find appropriate and what sentence we are advocating for.

We certainly disagree with the government. We think that this case is unique. We think that our client, Mr.

Farkas, is very unique with respect to his participation in the offense. And we think because of who he is, what the offense was, and his participation in the offense was, and where we are with the victims, and the availability of proceeds to make the victims whole, we think the sentence we are requesting is a sentence that's reasonable, and that's sufficient under the circumstances.

So, in any event, I would like to -- and we recognize that it would be a relatively extraordinary variance. And it's not to say that the parties all haven't agreed that a variance wouldn't be appropriate. I think it's an unusual case where the government, probation and the defense agree that some sentence below the low end of the guideline range would be an appropriate sentence. In this case we have that situation, and your Honor has at least from my view the unenviable task of figuring out what that is.

And so I'd like to start with the nature and

circumstances of the offense. There is very little I can add to the government's submission. Certainly there is little I can add to the PSR with respect to the nature and circumstances of this particular offense, your Honor.

The only thing that I would say is that the ICO lasted from July of 17 to October of 17, and a lot of the preliminary work for that ICO was done before Mr. Farkas even joined the company at the invitation of his sister's boyfriend. And that's somebody that Mr. Farkas really didn't know very well at the time, although your Honor has recognized that from Mr. Farkas's letters he is all too willing to help his sisters and his sister's friends when a call arises.

What did he do with respect to this offense? Quite simply, as the government recognized, he did what he was told, and that's why the parties have all agreed that a minor role adjustment would be appropriate.

So, what do you do with an individual who has been involved in a sophisticated offense but he is just sort of the unsophisticated guy? And I think that that's also reflected by the fact that we have a \$36 million intended loss here and a defendant who personally profited, at least from what our agreement is and what the numbers reflect, \$348,000, which is a relatively small percentage of that 36 million.

So, to a degree the offense itself vis-a-vis Mr. Farkas's participation in it seems to be overstated, and that's

often the problem when there is this giant amount of intended loss by an individual who played relatively speaking a minor role in that offense.

So, the offense itself may have been sophisticated.

Mr. Farkas's role in it may not have been all that
sophisticated insofar as he was just doing what he was told.

So then the question becomes who was he answering to. And I
think your Honor in arriving at a just and appropriate sentence has to look at the relative culpability of the parties in this case.

So, Mr. Farkas is someone who comes into the case after being recruited by a friend and future family member, and he comes into the case without having any experience in the finance world, in the cryptocurrency world. The furthest he got in college was part of a semester at West Virginia University before he withdrew.

So he had really no financial experience. He had literally gone from being a bartender to an assistant -- for lack of a better term -- in this cryptocurrency start-up. And you heard from Ms. Tekeei some of the things he did. He helped produce these videos. In other words he held the camera. He was present. He did not come up with the technology. He did not come up with a pitch deck -- in fact, there wasn't one. This is not the type of SEC-type fraud, securities fraud, white collar offense, where you have a bunch of individuals sitting

around going off a list of names of potential investors and cold calling them. That didn't happen here. So, it was more of what I would sort of to steal a phrase describe as irrational exuberance in the cryptocurrency market at the time, with all sorts of folks jumping into it, and on the basis of what somebody may have heard on Red-it, or on the basis of what somebody may have heard from some talking head on a podcast, decided to jump in and spend anywhere from hundreds of thousands to hundreds of dollars. So, that's what we have in this particular offense.

Fortunately -- fortunately -- Mr. Farkas's codefendants didn't waste the money. Now, the government makes a very good point -- and we believe it's a mitigator -- that Mr. Farkas never had any access to that 100,000 ether. He never had a claim to it. That wasn't his. It wasn't something that he was entrusted with. It wasn't something that he was directed to handle. He just simply had no access to it. We believe that that's a mitigator. But fortunately that 100,000 ether wasn't wasted by his codefendants in that it's available and that the government has now sold it -- and I note sold it for a profit. I think it's docket entry 410, the government-filed letter to your Honor indicating basically what all of these numbers are, and that is seems from that letter that the total amount of fraud proceeds are somewhere slightly north of \$36 million. The ether sale itself generated slightly

over \$33 million. And that's all more than what the government established as the value of that 100,000 ether, which was 29 million. So, I think the government was quite candid — and it's helpful to a degree — that there is some 4.4 million in appreciation of this cryptocurrency at the time of its sale, so that's more money that's now available for the victims in the offense, and of course none of it that Mr. Farkas either had access to or control over. And that's significant given what I was calling relative culpability.

So, Mr. Farkas again did what he was told. But who was he with? And who was he working with? Well, he didn't have any prior experience in finance, but both Mr. Trapani and Mr. Sharma — who both directed him in his activities — they both had experience in finance. They both had experience in let's say not telling the truth to people in finance. Mr. Trapani, for example, had been involved with some fraudulent activities before. Mr. Farkas didn't even know him. They met for the first time through Mr. Sharma. So when Mr. Farkas even became involved in this, he was a fish out of water — at least his water.

You know, Robert Farkas did not grow up in a world that would lead him to this, I think your Honor, but some of his traits -- what I would consider positive traits -- helped get him involved in this.

So RJ grew up in a pretty rural part of New Jersey.

He wanted to -- he was excelling in hockey when he was young. He hoped to get a scholarship, and hopefully at some point he wanted to play professional hockey. That all came to an end when he contracted Lyme disease. He couldn't play anymore. He spent about a year in bed. And candidly I know the government had some issues with Mr. Farkas's Lyme disease, but it's something that's there. I don't know whether the right word would be that it's dormant or whether it's in remission, but no matter how you slice it, the Lyme disease is not something that's going away and it's something that affected his life negatively, and it's something that has helped to shape his life from his teen years thereon. So, that hockey scholarship was unavailable to him.

He followed some of his friends and went to University of West Virginia, and whether it was the Lyme disease or his ADHD, he just couldn't get through that first semester, Judge. So, he had to drop out, and he went to bartending; he became a waiter. But he is also somebody who is loyal to a fault perhaps, loyal to his sisters, kind to those around him, and as a result of that he ultimately moved to Florida. He wanted to be closer with his sister as part of the move, and he wanted to try to try to start something new in his life. And he got about as far as bartending until he was invited to assist Mr. Sharma in Centra Tech. And maybe that's what I mean by he is perhaps kind and helpful and maybe loyal to a fault, because

that's what got him involved in this offense, and it is something that is far bigger than he is.

I think the characteristics that he has, coupled with the nature and circumstances of the offense and his role in it, all shout out for a sentence far below the guideline sentence, particularly when one looks at the 22-level increase that the loss amount causes in the advisory guideline range with respect to Mr. Farkas's minor involvement or minor role therein.

So it seems from the government's presentation, your Honor, that the crux of its concern is that the sentence that we're asking for and the government's view doesn't reflect the seriousness of the offense or promote respect for the law or just punishment but almost most strikingly that it doesn't provide for adequate deterrence, whether specific or general deterrence, and on that score we disagree.

Mr. Farkas is a different defendant than Mr. Trapani and Mr. Sharma. He is perhaps not the right defendant to send this message via. He is not perhaps the right vehicle to send that type of message, because none of this was his idea; none of this was his thing. And he followed folks like Mr. Trapani in conducting himself while at Centra Tech.

But with respect to deterrence -- and I want to talk about specific deterrence first -- the jail that Mr. Farkas has created for himself -- or perhaps that circumstances have created for him -- has a far more significant deterrent effect

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

than any jail could ever have. Your Honor knows from the letters that you read what happened to Mr. Farkas's father upon Mr. Farkas's arrest. Mr. Farkas' father was so distraught that he tried to take his own life. RJ caused that. He has to look at his father at every Thanksgiving, for every holiday that they will all spend together, he has to look at his father whenever he sees him, knowing that he caused that to happen. There can be no better deterrent effect than that, knowing that his conduct has that effect on his family, on his friends, on the victims in this case, and now on his immediate family and his daughter Isabella. He knows that the rest of his life he has to walk a straight line. He knows what he has caused. There can be no more suffering that he could endure, no amount of jail time that your Honor could give him that could substitute for the look that he has to see in his father when his father looks back at him, knowing what he caused his father That's an adequate deterrent. to do or attempt.

It's also an adequate deterrent when he looks at his young family. Now, the government suggests that this circumstance is not a mitigator because it's more of a life choice. Well, I submit that having a child is not always necessarily a life choice and sometimes some things happen, but one thing is for sure here, that the child that RJ and Donna had will be the only child that they will have.

Your Honor has read through the suffering that they

both went through during Isabella's birth and the medical issues that Donna has now had as a result. There is no reason for me to repeat them now; they are all very personal matters; and your Honor has reviewed them in the letters. That's a deterrent effect. This is the only child that he and Donna will have, and he wants to do things with her, he wants to be there for her, he wants to be the guiding light in her life, and that's not something that you do from behind bars, and that's not something that this young man is going to risk losing by engaging in something this stupid ever again. Frankly, I don't think that anything like this was ever in Robert's DNA. He was a blue collar guy in a white collar offense.

THE COURT: So long as you raised that -- you don't have to answer the question, but it is one that is in my mind. That is, given what happened here, and the circumstances, I can understand given where he was in his life and who these people were, and what the prospects were, why he agreed to join this business venture, but what he did was blatantly dishonest and was all in an effort to get money from investors. And I guess what I don't understand is why he didn't walk away when he saw what was happening. Anything you want to share on that?

MR. PETRUZZI: I think I alluded to it earlier, your Honor. The traits that make Robert a good brother, a kind soul, a loyal person, sometimes those traits are traits that

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

get people into trouble when they are misguided, when they don't get the full picture. Part of it -- part of it -- was his understanding -- and albeit perhaps a wrong-headed understanding -- his understanding was that he was trying to make a business succeed. It was a wrong-headed understanding. It was something that was his belief at the time. It doesn't excuse the knowing misrepresentations that he made. It doesn't excuse the fact that he was part of these criminal agreements.

And your Honor can see in the government's submissions there were often times when his codefendants, Mr. Sharma would say, RJ, you have to clean this up -- and I am paraphrasing -but there were misrepresentations made in the white papers that existed before RJ started the company. And when the money began rolling in what I described as this irrational exuberance in the crypto world, when the money started rolling in, these parties -- at least the principals -- decided that they needed to continue in trying to make things right. And it was misguided beyond belief, and it was in many ways compounding the problem because misrepresentations were made, and you don't correct misrepresentations by adding additional misrepresentations to them or continuing to make them. much is understood, and that's why Mr. Farkas pleaded guilty. That's why Mr. Farkas is doing what he can to make sure that the victims receive all of their investments back. And we have an opportunity for that to happen in case thankfully.

So, to try to answer your Honor's question, he was in too deep and it was a brief period of time. The ICO again lasted from July until October of 2017, and then shortly thereafter the SEC became involved, and things snowballed to a point where he was ultimately charged with this offense. But we are talking about a period of time that can be measured in months — a few months.

I agree with your Honor. He agrees with your Honor. He recognizes the pain that he caused. He recognizes the lies that he told that for one reason or another — either directly or indirectly — got people to spend money and give money to Centra Tech, and those investments were supported by a bed of false statements. He knows that, your Honor. That's why we're in criminal court. He understands that. The question is whether the sentence that we're asking for is the sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary under the circumstances to send him a message.

THE COURT: Let me ask another question. Looking forward rather than backwards, I understand that he wants to take care of his family and wants to have a different life, and I believe that he is very sincere about that, but what can you tell me about his plans for future employment?

MR. PETRUZZI: Very well. So, the recidivism question is an issue. I think it's something that is addressed by his future employment prospects. Also, the fact that he is not a

likely recidivist is something that's apparent from the record. He has no priors. He has no traffic tickets that we know of. He was 31 when the offense occurred. He is 34 now. And his future prospects, as indicated in the presentence report, are with his family's business. He intends to help his father in the family business like he has been doing. He is not in Centra Tech because there is no Centra Tech, and it's not his thing anyhow, Judge.

THE COURT: I guess what I understood was part of the reason he got into Centra Tech is that he didn't really want to be part of the family business; he wanted to do something different; and he wanted to do something he was passionate about and that was not working in the family business. And so I guess one concern I have is, you know, what is he going to do in the future that gives him satisfaction in what he wants and the ability to support his family that is realistic and law abiding.

MR. PETRUZZI: To answer that sort of in the negative, it would be unrealistic for him to get into any financial business. He has no training in that regard, and now he is going to be saddled with a felony fraud conviction. So, I suspect nobody will be sending him any invitations to participate in any type of financial business ever again, so he will be working with his dad on the family business like he has been.

Your Honor has the presentence report, and his current employment to my mind isn't any different from what his future employment will be. It's something he has done while he has been on bond for the past two plus years, some of which was home confinement, a large portion of it. Nevertheless, it's something that he does now. Whether it makes him happy to be close to his father, I can answer for him. The answer is yes. Whether it makes him happy to be in his father's business, he can answer for your Honor, but I do believe that to be yes as well.

It's not the high-flying crypto world, but then again he is not really cut out for that anyhow, Judge. It even brings to mind some of the things that he was asked to do with his market manipulation. He was even told to stop doing that by the folks who told him what to do at Centra Tech because he couldn't even do it right.

This is not a white collar crime guy. He just is not, Judge. What is going to make him happiest in the future is spending time with his daughter and his family, and doing some type of work with his father in his father's business to make it grow.

I can't predict the future, but if the past is any good predicter of the future, this is a young man who up until age 31 never did anything wrong, worked hard, worked in jobs like bartending and being a waiter and laying tile. Those are

jobs that he worked in.

I think what will make him happiest now as he embarks on this new part of his life is his family and his daughter and his soon-to-be wife.

Not everybody enjoys their employment. Some people just have jobs to take care of their families. I believe RJ is one of them.

Sending a general deterrent message is also an issue that the government raised, and in a vacuum I would agree with them, but there are two other individuals in this case that your Honor can send those messages via. But more than that Mr. Farkas pleaded guilty to 18 U.S.C. 371, and Congress has already made a determination as to what penalties are appropriate for a violation of that statute, and they range from probation — which is authorized — to five years. To sentence this defendant, Mr. Farkas, at the top of the statutory maximum of 18 U.S.C. 371 as opposed to the bottom, I think would be just inappropriate under the circumstances, given who he is, what his participation was in the offense, but mostly, you know, where he is going to be in the future.

He doesn't appear to be someone likely to be a recidivist -- he just doesn't -- and I think your Honor can send a general deterrent message consistent with this being a Class B felony, consistent with the penalties that have been promulgated by Congress.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

We would ask for your Honor to impose a nonincarcerative sentence. Mr. Farkas has already done 55 days in custody. In a vacuum 55 days doesn't seem to be a whole lot for those of us who are federal practitioners, but for this particular defendant who had never been arrested before, who hadn't even been stopped for a traffic ticket, it's significant. He spent time in the Federal Detention Center in Miami, which is a maximum security facility. From there he was moved to Atlanta to the USP, which is another maximum security facility. From there he was moved to Oklahoma, which was another maximum facility, and from there he was moved to the MCC. He got a tour of the United States in maximum custody, with belly chains, being transported on airplanes from one city to another for two months while his father was in the hospital after nearly killing himself, while his other family members were obviously concerned about him. Judge, that was hard time. It may have been brief, but it was hard time.

After that he was on home confinement, and he did fine. He didn't have even the slightest hiccup while on home confinement, to the point where the parties agreed to modify that and change it to house arrest with a curfew. And he stayed with that curfew for many, many months, and he has done fine on supervision. It just doesn't seem to make a whole lot of sense to have someone who has been on supervision — stringent supervision — for two years, to then turn around and

be incarcerated.

I understand the government's concerns about general deterrence. I just don't think that Mr. Farkas is the right person to send that message through. And, frankly, I think your Honor would be authorized and well within your Honor's discretion to express general deterrence by a nonincarcerative sentence. That's what we're asking for.

I don't know whether your Honor had any other questions for me, but I'm happy to answer them.

THE COURT: No, I did ask my questions already. Thank you.

MR. PETRUZZI: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Mr. Farkas, if you would like to speak, now is your opportunity. You don't have to say anything. I have a pretty good understanding of what happened here, having read all the papers and heard from the lawyers, and I read your letter, but if you would like to say anything, I would like to hear it.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

I'm generally not much of a talker, and I would like to save the Court's time, so I will be brief.

I do want to say that I am extremely ashamed of my actions -- I'm sorry -- and I am fully aware of the impact my criminal conduct caused my family, my friends and the many victims. Not a day goes by without me thinking about all of

them, including the anxiety and financial hardship that I have inflicted on the victims. If they can hear me now, I want them to know that I have personally experienced hardship, depression and anxiety myself, and I know what it's like. There are not enough words for me to find to say that I'm sorry to the victims, but I'm sincerely sorry. I have tried to make sure they can get back everything they lost.

As I rock my daughter to sleep every night, I think of what kind of father I want to be. I want to protect her, see her grow, take her to her first day of school, read her a book before bed, and remind her that she can be whatever she chooses to be, and to help her make the right choice in life.

Being with her, being her father is the most incredible and fulfilling role that I have been granted, and it saddens me at the same time. I was on the verge of losing my own father because of my conduct, and this is something that I cannot and will not forget.

The last three years has put life in perspective for me and has allowed me to look into deeper issues that I was trying to cover up for years, and appreciate things that I didn't consider important.

I hope that I can be a father, son, and the positive member of society that I always wanted to be, and look back on my life in years to come proud of the man I became.

To your Honor and any victims actually listening right

now, thank you for your time. 1 2 3 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 I am required to address any victim who is present and 5 permit them to be reasonably heard. 6 Ms. Tekeei, are you aware of any victims who are 7 present? 8 MS. TEKEEI: I am not aware of any victims who are 9 present, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: OK. I don't know if people are muted, but 11 I see that there are two call-in users who are actually not 12 If there are any victims on the phone who would like to 13 be heard, now is your opportunity to be heard. 14 I don't hear from any of the three lines that are OK. 15 unmuted, so I will assume if there are any victims present, that they did not need to be heard beyond the letters that I 16 17 have received and of course reviewed. 18 Mr. Petruzzi, is there any reason why sentence should 19 not be imposed? 20 MR. PETRUZZI: There isn't, your Honor, but it 21 occurred to me that I didn't ask for a particular sentence, so 22 if I may, I had alluded to a nonincarcerative sentence. 23 asking that your Honor impose a sentence of time served

followed by five years of supervised release with a special

condition of 18 months of home confinement.

24

25

THE COURT: Thank you. I think that's something slightly different from what I saw in your papers, so thank you for that clarification.

Ms. Tekeei, is there any reason why sentence should not be imposed?

MS. TEKEEI: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. So, as I have stated, the guideline range applicable in this case is 70 to 87 months, which is equal to five years and ten months to seven years and three months.

Under the Supreme Court's decision in United States v.

Booker and cases that have followed it, that recommendation is

just one of the factors that courts are required to consider.

There is a list of factors that I'm also required to consider

in the statute called 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a), and those

include, first, the nature and circumstances of the offense, as

well as Mr. Farkas's own personal history and characteristics.

Also -- and the lawyers have been talking about this a fair amount -- the need to have the sentence reflect the seriousness of the offense, afford adequate deterrence, protect the public from further crime, provide the defendant with needed educational or vocational training, and I am also required to impose a sentence that is sufficient but no greater than necessary to comply with the purposes set out above.

Another factor is the need to avoid unwarranted sentence

disparities among similarly situated defendants. And I would just note the other defendants in this case have not been sentenced, and I also see and accept counsel's representations — both the government's and the defendant's — that your role was a much lesser role than the other two defendants, so I don't actually think that factor of sentencing disparity is relevant here, except I think a fair and proportional sentence of course is one that is less than, for example, Mr. Sharma's by a great deal.

In any event, I find that the sentence I am about to pronounce is sufficient but not greater than necessary to satisfy all of these various purposes that I have just mentioned.

So, there is no sentencing that is easy, and this one is certainly no exception. And I thought carefully about it and considered all the materials. And I have to start with the offense. There is no way around it. In my mind, this is a very serious offense. It was a blatant fraud. It was visited on over a hundred victims. The amount of money perhaps because of the exuberance of the market, the amounts of money are staggering, almost \$30 million on the conservative side. And although your role was the least culpable one, and you did what you were told and you were not a supervisor, certainly the things that you did was dishonest and fraudulent by any measure, and so in my mind that makes this a very serious

crime.

I know you were arrested in April and remanded and spent some time in jail until May 25, so you spent almost two months in jail: And I know that was a time that was difficult for you, certainly not something in your experience. I know you don't have a criminal history. You're now 34 years old, so certainly you are a young plan, and I credit the fact that you really want a different life, you want to turn your life around. Are you not the kind of person who should be spending time with criminals or in jail.

I know you were born and raised in New Jersey in a stable and loving family; I can see that by the people who are surrounding you right now. And I know about this important relationship you have with your fiancee and your daughter and how that has really changed your perspective on what is important and what you need to do in your life.

But, in addition to supporting your daughter, you need to set an example, and I hope going forward that that is something that you will be able to do.

I know you have been working in your family's business for a long time, since 2000, and I understand you wanted to do something different, and I also appreciate what your lawyer says, which is that you understand that at least at the moment the family business is where something stable is, where a stable income is, and something you know how to do and do well,

but I would also like you to get some job counseling, to take some tests to find out what your aptitudes are, what fits your personality and figure out — and maybe in the end the answer to all of that is your family business, but I want you, because you are a young man I want you to explore that, because I think that condition and naivety in part led you to this crime, and I hope that as you move forward you will be realistic about what you can do and realistic about your obligations to your family.

So, I know that your friends and your family portray you as someone who is kind and thoughtful and attentive -perhaps to a fault -- to those around you and those who are close to you. I feel like from the letters I have seen I have a good sense of who you are. But notwithstanding that -- and I don't mean to leave it a mystery -- I think it's important to impose a sentence of incarceration under the circumstances, because of the nature of the crime, to promote respect for the law and also for what is called general deterrence, to send a message to other people who might consider committing this kind of crime.

Unfortunately, I can't just consider you alone and your circumstances. There are broader considerations like just punishment, the seriousness of the crime, general deterrence, all of those things that don't necessarily have to do with your individual circumstances but that are part of what goes into sentencing. And so that is something that I have to consider,

and this is something I think that is driving the sentence.

So the probation department recommends a below-guideline sentence of 60 months, which is five years, plus a \$25,000 fine. The government recommends a below-guidelines custodial sentence, without specifying how much. And your lawyer asked for a below-guideline sentence of time served, five years supervised release, with 18 months home confinement. And I assume this was still part of the suggestion — it was in the papers but not something that was just mentioned — that is also some amount of community service.

MR. PETRUZZI: Yes.

THE COURT: Thank you. And, as I said, I am considering the offenses of your codefendants, but in my mind that only argues for a lesser sentence for you because there is a real difference how much they gained and stood to gain from the crime and also the nature of their participation compared with yours.

So, I will now state the sentence I intend to impose, and the attorneys will have a final opportunity to make legal objections before it's final.

Mr. Farkas, after assessing the particular facts of this case, the factors under Section 3553(a), including the sentencing guidelines, I conclude that a sentence below the guidelines is justified as follows:

Mr. Farkas, it is the judgment of the Court that you are to serve a custodial sentence of a year and a day, to be followed by three years of supervised release, all to be served concurrently on both counts.

And I am going to make a special condition of your supervised release 200 hours of community service, as directed by the probation department. And I am also going to put a proviso on that, and that is that it must be directly assisting people who are in need. Because I hope you will understand from the experience that there are many people -- particularly these times in the pandemic -- whose lives are so much more difficult than all of us who are here on the phone, including you, and I am hoping that by helping other people, that will give you some perspective in how to organize your life as you go forward.

In imposing a term of supervised release, with all of the various conditions, I am not doing that for punishment, but I am doing it to help you try to organize and arrange to live the kind of life I know you want to live, to set an example for your daughter.

The standard conditions of supervised release will apply. You must also meet the following special conditions which are explained in detail in the presentence report and which I'm just summarizing:

First, you must not commit another crime, federal

state or local; you must not illegally possess a controlled substance. You must not possess a firearm or destructive device. Mandatory drug testing is suspended. I don't think that's an issue for you. You will also cooperate in the collection of your DNA.

What I am going to do though is require an outpatient drug testing and treatment program as specified in the PSR, so not the occasional testing but outpatient program; also outpatient mental health treatment, as specified in the presentence report; also an employment assistance program that will help you assess your skills and aptitudes and provide guidelines on getting the necessary training for you to fulfill your obligations.

Once you are released, you will submit to a search of your home, workplace, vehicle, anywhere under your control. You will provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information. You must not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless you are in compliance with the installment payment schedule that I assume will be agreed upon for you to repay the forfeiture amount.

And after you are released from prison, you are to report to the nearest probation office within 72 hours, and you will be supervised in the district of your residence.

I am not imposing a fine because with the forfeiture

obligation and your other financial obligation, I don't believe you would have the ability to pay a fine. Restitution is taken care of with the prior order I signed. I will sign a separate order of forfeiture. And I am imposing a mandatory special assessment of \$200, which will be due immediately.

Does either counsel know of any legal reason why the sentence should not be imposed as stated? Mr. Petruzzi?

MR. PETRUZZI: No, I don't, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Tekeei?

MS. TEKEEI: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, the sentence as stated is imposed.

Are there any applications in connection with the sentence? Mr. Petruzzi?

MR. PETRUZZI: Yes, your Honor. I would ask that your Honor recommend to the Bureau of Prisons that Mr. Farkas be incarcerated at a facility in South Florida consistent with his custody level.

THE COURT: OK. And how about his surrender date?

MR. PETRUZZI: If I could also add to that if it's all right with your Honor, that he could serve part of his sentence in a residential reentry center? I believe that they are under the auspices of the Bureau of Prisons, so it would count as incarcerative.

THE COURT: I don't know if that is within my purview. You may. But the general message I've gotten is that courts

don't specify where and how the sentences are served. So, I
don't think I can do that.

But I will make a recommendation to a facility in South Florida consistent with his custody level, in order to facilitate -- and I have been told it's important to say why -- in order to facilitate family visitation.

Did you want to make a request about a surrender date?

MR. PETRUZZI: If I can have a moment, your Honor, so
I can ask Mr. Farkas, text him something.

THE COURT: Sure.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  PETRUZZI: If we can ask for sometime January or February.

THE COURT: Let's say May. I am concerned about the pandemic. If he really wants to do it in January and get it over with, I will, but it seems to me late spring might be better, but that's not for me to decide; it's really for you all.

MR. PETRUZZI: Let me suggest this. If your Honor would be kind enough to set a date in April, that would be great. And if Mr. Farkas wants to surrender before that, then I suppose he always could.

THE COURT: OK. What you will have to do is wait for the Bureau of Prisons to send you where he will be designated, so in other words where you should surrender, but I think they will do that far in advance. I will make the surrender date

Friday, April 30 at 2 p.m. And if for some -- well, I will just leave it at that, Friday, April 30 at 2 p.m.

Ms. Tekeei, are there any open counts that need to be dismissed?

MS. TEKEEI: Your Honor, there is an underlying indictment that the government moves to dismiss.

THE COURT: OK, I will grant that application. And,
Ms. Tekeei, I would also like by a week from today a letter
from you along the lines we discussed, basically with a
proposal for updating the Court and also whatever you can tell
me about how you expect the claims process to proceed.

Mr. Farkas, subject to your waiver of rights in the plea agreement, you may have the right to appeal your conviction of sentence. If you are unable to pay the cost of appeal, you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. The notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the judgment of conviction.

And what I will do is I will just continue your bail conditions, so in other words just continue to do what you have done in terms of complying with your bail conditions. And please be sure and surrender by April 30, because if you don't, your failure to report could result in a charge for a separate criminal offense.

I want to thank you again, all of your family and friends for the support they have given to you. It's so

important. Let me just address them for a minute. 1 2 Mr. Farkas really needs your help in trying to have a 3 life that he needs and wants to have, and so I hope that you 4 will give him your emotional support and be there for him 5 during these next months, because I expect that they will be 6 challenging. 7 And, Mr. Farkas, I wish you the best of luck I see a different future for you, very different than the one from your 8 9 past. I believe you can do it, and so the best of luck to you. 10 Also there was a government request to file their 11 submission with redactions, and I will grant that request. 12 Thank you, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Anything else we need to do? 14 MS. TEKEEI: Not from the government. MR. PETRUZZI: Nor from the defense. Thank you very 15 16 much for your time, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: OK, thank you. We are adjourned. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25